

protector of freedom and liberty who died at a much too early age. We should always reflect on the dedication put forth by our Capitol Hill police. They deserve our thanks.

PROTECTING THE PUBLIC DRINKING WATER

(Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, we are now focusing on airport security. That is appropriate. But in doing that, I hope that we are not neglecting security of other very essential parts of our infrastructure. I am thinking particularly of water.

Our vast municipal and public water systems were developed to be economical and to be efficient, and they are both. We are one of the few countries in the world that can water our grass and wash our cars and flush our toilets and fight our fires with drinking water. Our water systems were not developed with any eye toward security.

We just passed out of the Committee on Science a very important bill that supports R&D, looking at ways to make our very important water system infrastructure more secure to terrorists. This bill needs to come very quickly to the floor because this is one area of our infrastructure we cannot afford to continue to be at risk.

□ 0915

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3009, ANDEAN TRADE PROMOTION AND DRUG ERADI- CATION ACT

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 289 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 289

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 3009) to extend the Andean Trade Preference Act, to grant additional trade benefits under that Act, and for other purposes. The bill shall be considered as read for amendment. The amendment recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means now printed in the bill shall be considered as adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate on the bill, as amended, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). The gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), pend-

ing which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purposes of debate only.

(Mr. DIAZ-BALART asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 289 is a closed rule providing for consideration of H.R. 3009, the Andean Trade Promotion and Drug Eradication Act. The rule provides 1 hour of general debate, evenly divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means and one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The Committee on Rules provided the opportunity for the minority, Mr. Speaker, to offer a substitute. However, they declined the opportunity. This is a fair rule, Mr. Speaker, that will allow consideration of this very important issue.

The underlying legislation promotes and strengthens the U.S.-Andean trade relationship which will increase economic growth in the United States. This legislation will also work to bolster anti-corruption programs in South America.

As originally passed by Congress in 1991, the Andean Trade Preference Act sought to provide assistance to countries that have been troubled in the recent past in the form of tariff-free American goods, while simultaneously opening American markets to certain exports from these Nations. The effect of offering strategic economic advantages to these countries was to help eliminate financial dependence on narco-trafficking in the Andean region.

Due to ATPA, the U.S. and the Andean nations have enjoyed an \$18 billion beneficial trade relationship for the past 10 years, but all of this is set to expire on December 4 if we do not act to extend the best elements of ATPA and continue the support of our allies in the Andean region.

The extension of ATPA is not merely a matter of economic or trade policy but is, in fact, a decision with consequences for U.S. foreign and national policy in the western hemisphere.

Bolivia, Colombia, Peru and Ecuador are nations that are good solid allies in the United States. They have repeatedly indicated over the past decade that they wish to be strong members of a free and democratic hemisphere, a hemisphere hopefully one day free of terrorism as well as free of tyranny.

Continuing ATPA will help the Andean nations fight poverty, terrorism and drug production as well as further promote democracy and human rights.

ATPA promotes job creation in a region where the alternative for many workers is easily a life devoted to drug production. ATPA provides these individuals an alternative and protects the rights of Andean workers. It also helps the economy in the United States and helps American workers. The bill contains the same worker protections con-

tained in the Trade Development Act of 2000. Promoting development in the region, in the western hemisphere, is crucial to a U.S. foreign policy that seeks to support countries fighting against terrorism and drug trafficking.

I urge my colleagues to consider the benefits of extending ATPA, not only to our South American neighbors but also to American consumers who enjoy a wide variety of product choice without artificial constraints and restrictions.

Extending and improving ATPA is a decisive step toward improved relations with the western hemisphere. This legislation will foster the expression of mutually supportive and beneficial relationships between the United States and our neighbors in this hemisphere.

This legislation will help in the effort to strengthen our economy and add to the stabilization of the Andean region. There have been numerous challenges to democracy in the Andean region in the past decade. Many of them have been overcome, but it is still an area that is very delicate; and we must help it, especially since all of the countries in the Andean region are solid allies in the United States.

I would like to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) and all of those who have worked very diligently on this important piece of legislation. This is a fair rule, providing for the consideration of very important legislation, Mr. Speaker. I urge my colleagues to support both the rule and the underlying legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Ms. SLAUGHTER asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART), for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

I rise in opposition to the closed rule. I oppose the process it represents and the indifference it signals for our colleagues on both sides of the aisle with legitimate concern over this bill.

No one in this body disputes the importance of U.S. efforts to counter drug production in South America, but the measure before us is simply not ready for floor consideration. In a hastily thrown together Rules hearing this morning, it became apparent that serious, substantive questions remained regarding the impact of this measure on many regions of this country.

Our colleagues from California, Puerto Rico, and American Samoa expressed concern over how this measure would impact the domestic processing and fishing industry. They have profound concerns over this measure accelerating job losses in an already unstable economy.

My friend and colleague, the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs.

MYRICK), expressed heartfelt reservations over the impact these trade measures have on the region of the country where the textile industry is struggling. I have no doubt that other Members would have similar concerns if they had only been afforded the opportunity to review the underlying bill.

Moreover, why is the leadership prioritizing this measure when other, pressing needs affecting our constituents at a time of war are never allowed to see the light of day? I do not mean to disparage our friends to the south, but ensuring the duty-free treatment of 6,000 products from the Andean countries of Bolivia, Colombia, Ecuador, and Peru surely should not take precedence over legislation impacting our homeland security and measures to help those who have lost jobs and loved ones in the wake of September 11.

Finally, the leadership missed a golden opportunity with this measure to rebuild the bipartisanship that previously existed on trade matters. Had the chairman worked on a bipartisan basis with the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), the ranking member on the Committee on Ways and Means, I have no doubt that the measure would enjoy broader support both in the Committee on Ways and Means and on the floor. That bipartisanship enabled measures like the African free trade bill to move forward last year and would have been welcomed by proponents of fair trade on both sides of the aisle.

This process does not bode well for fast track advocates who are hoping to craft an agreement to move forward in the days ahead.

Mr. Speaker, Members are fully aware that the Andean nations are struggling to combat the problems of illegal drugs, and while their economy is falling into recession and their governments confront civil unrest, the concerns of our colleagues certainly would have been better taken into account so this measure could move forward with less controversy.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Before yielding to my distinguished colleague, the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. MYRICK), I would simply point out that this legislation passed out of the Committee on Ways and Means on a voice vote. It has the cosponsorship of many people on both sides of the aisle, including the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), the ranking member, who was an original cosponsor.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to my distinguished colleague, the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. MYRICK).

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART), for yielding me the time.

I hate to be standing up here today and doing this; but very honestly, I

cannot support the Andean trade bill, and I understand completely the importance of this bill to our neighbors to the south and what it means relative to trying to get stable businesses started in those countries.

I serve on the Speaker's drug task force so I am very much aware of all of that, but I disagree with the timing in particular of this being brought up before the trade promotion authority vote is on the floor.

I am not a protectionist. I am a free trader. I totally support free trade. I voted for it before many times; but quite frankly, it also needs to be fair trade, and we need to be able to export our products into those same countries freely, as well as them bringing theirs into ours.

Never in my 7 years on Capitol Hill have I seen a bigger slap in the face to the textile industry and the workers because in the last year, just the last year alone, we have lost 60,000 jobs, 20,000 of them in my State of North Carolina and most of them in my district.

As the New York Times reported on Tuesday, our Nation's economic slowdown has impacted the South more than any other region of the country, and how does Congress respond? On the very day after Burlington Industries, which is one of the largest textile companies in the world, the day after they file for bankruptcy, we have this bill on the floor that gives away our textile jobs. It is just unbelievable to me.

Make no mistake about it, H.R. 3009, as reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, allows other nations to avoid our duties and quotas by shipping their yarn and fabric through South America.

The only bill that the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) has shown to me, and every other textile State lawmaker, would smooth the way for Andean apparel made with fabric and yarn from anywhere in the world. It would create a giant loophole in our textile trade laws, and for weeks now the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) has said this loophole will be fixed, but I have never seen a fix and neither has anybody else.

There is a larger issue at stake here, and this is an issue that is very important to the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), my chairman of the Committee on Rules. He is on this floor practically every day speaking about it and that is trade promotion authority.

The bill coming to the floor in just a few days is one that I would desperately like to support because I believe it is very important to give our President that authority to open foreign markets and to protect our jobs here at home. I am very afraid by having this bill on the floor at this time it is going to doom those efforts.

I just think that the folks who scheduled this vote are making a very, very serious mistake. There are several textile State lawmakers who, like myself, want to support the President on TPA,

and what are they asked to do? They are asked to vote on a bill today that is bad for textiles just a few days ahead of this other bill coming to the floor. Hard to understand.

Some folks say this will not hurt the President's efforts on TPA because textile State lawmakers are not going to vote for this anyway. Well, that is a bunch of bull crap, excuse my French. Very simply, there are a lot of us who want to vote for it and have done everything we can to try and make that possible because we believe in it. We have been promised assistance for the textile industry, but no package has appeared yet.

The gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) has shown us language that would help crack down on transshipments, but the language has not reached the floor. I have heard plenty of talk and promises, but the promises have resulted in nothing; and quite frankly, until something is voted on on the floor it is just a promise.

So while we wait, the leadership brings an antitextile bill to the floor. This could have been brought up later. It could have been an extension. There are many ways we could have dealt with this, to have the vote after the TPA vote; but that has not happened.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am very afraid that the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) is making it easy for those who are on the fence to vote no.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from American Samoa (Mr. FALÉOMAVAEGA).

(Mr. FALÉOMAVAEGA asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FALÉOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to preface my remarks in associating myself also with the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. MYRICK) for her comments and certainly our total opposition to the rule.

Mr. Speaker, I want to plainly state for the RECORD that I do support U.S. efforts to counter drug interdiction and production in trade among the Andean countries. I also want to note that I am a free trader but only ask that trade be fair. That is all we are asking for.

For the information of my colleagues, the U.S. tuna industry has already provided under the current provisions of the Andean trade agreement explosive growth in opportunity for our Andean country neighbors.

□ 0930

Under the present ATPA rules, tuna loins are already exempt from any of the meaningful duties. As a result, the number of tuna loin factories in Andean countries have increased by 229 percent since the enactment of ATPA in 1991. Production capacity has increased by 400 percent. Exports to the United States have increased by 56 percent. Sales of tuna from the Andean countries now total almost \$100 million a year. Thanks to the present ATPA tuna rules, Andean countries are now the largest exporters of tuna to our country.

In return for U.S. efforts, Ecuador currently imposes a 20 percent duty on canned tuna from the United States. Other Andean countries impose duties of 10 percent and 15 percent. To protect its own market from product dumping, Mexico imports a duty free of 24 percent on canned tuna imported from Ecuador. In the middle of all this, Mr. Speaker, is the U.S. Congress really now going to allow canned tuna to come to the United States duty free? Where is the fairness of all of this, Mr. Speaker?

I believe it is important for my colleagues to understand that Ecuador and Colombia have the capacity now to process more than 540,000 tons or 48.6 million cases of tuna per year. With U.S. consumption of 45.3 million cases per year, Ecuador and Colombia have the production capacity to wipe out literally, Mr. Speaker, the entire U.S. tuna industry.

In an effort to save approximately 10,000 American jobs and protect the fragile economy of my own district in my own territory, including workers in California and Puerto Rico, the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), the ranking member of the Committee on Ways and Means; the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM), and I have worked together to build, hopefully, a bipartisan coalition to object to this legislation.

I want to note for the RECORD that Chicken of the Sea, Bumble Bee, the United Tuna Cooperative, the entire U.S. fishing fleet, and ConAgra are adamantly opposed to the inclusion of canned tuna in ATPA.

With all due respect, Mr. Speaker, I am also disappointed that no hearings were held in the House on this very bill. I would hope that Members whose districts would be potentially affected by pending legislation such as this will be given the courtesy at least of an input of Members of the House whose districts are definitely going to be affected as a result of this bill.

The bottom line, in my humble opinion, Mr. Speaker, is that my territory is more than 85 percent dependent, either directly or indirectly, on the U.S. tuna processing and fishing industries. As StarKist has repeatedly testified, "A decrease in production or departure of one or both of the existing processors in American Samoa would devastate the local economy, resulting in massive unemployment and insurmountable financial problems."

This begs the question, Mr. Speaker: Why is only canned tuna up for discussion? What happened to the other industries doing their fair share to provide economic alternatives to drug production in the Andean countries? I am all for helping our Andean countries, but I want to ensure that the U.S. tuna industry, the U.S. tuna fishing fleet, and the workers in California, Puerto Rico, and American Samoa are also protected in the process.

I want to quickly note that if canned tuna is not excluded, this country will

see the end of the U.S. fishing fleet which is composed of 50 vessels. Investments in these vessels are worth hundreds of millions of dollars. Our World War II veterans built this fleet and for almost 100 years, the tuna industry has been with us. In times of national crisis, our tuna fishing fleet has been our eyes and ears on the high seas. Our fishing fleets report to the Coast Guard and other Federal agencies any suspicious movements of vessels that may also affect the security of our Nation.

My colleagues need to understand that there are no fishing licenses left in the eastern Pacific. Our U.S. tuna fishing fleet cannot fish in the eastern region of the Pacific. What kind of justice is this, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker, canned tuna represents the third fastest moving product category in the entire U.S. grocery business. Canned tuna provides a high-quality, affordable source of protein for 96 percent of U.S. families. If H.R. 3009 is not amended, if this legislation is not shut down, canned tuna will become a foreign-controlled commodity instead of a branded product that U.S. consumers have trusted with confidence for over 95 years.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote down on this proposed rule concerning this legislation, and I urge my colleagues to exclude canned tuna from this bill and vote against the rule which will not allow Members from both sides of the aisle to introduce appropriate amendments so that at least we can debate the merits of this bill.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS), the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means.

(Mr. THOMAS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, when the world changes, it is always difficult and sometimes painful, but the fact of the matter is, the world will change. In this area of economic relationships, it is becoming extremely dynamic.

First of all, people need to understand that the people who primarily take the floor are those who are opposed to what is going to occur. We do not ordinarily get an enormous number of people who are in support. So when we listen to the arguments that people are making as to why we should be opposed to this bill, which allows for modest importations from sub-Saharan Africa, modest adjustments for the Caribbean region, and the opportunity, for the first time, for the Andean region, which has taken significant responsibility for reducing the production of coca and, therefore, cocaine, taking away literally a cash crop and not getting anything in return, that what we are doing is reaching out to them in this bill.

Mr. Speaker, T-shirts, if you will, are going to be produced somewhere in the world. I understand my friends from the former textile-producing areas, be-

cause quite frankly, in the latter part of the last century it was New England that was the textile center of the U.S. What we saw was movement regionally to the Atlantic States and then to the South because it was following cheap labor. And what has happened is, it has begun to jump off the North American continent and continues to find cheap labor.

Cheap labor is all over the world. The T-shirt, if it is not made in the U.S., is going to be made somewhere: Madagascar, Bangladesh, India. It is not going to be made in the U.S. And the idea that if we simply stop the world, we are going to keep the jobs, that is just not reality.

What we have to do is rethink our relationships. What the U.S. can do and do well is to continue to supply fabric, cotton, primarily yarn, and also raw material.

Now, where do we have a better chance of sustaining the U.S.'s future role in textiles coming into the U.S.? Making sure that the people who send that T-shirt, either in Madagascar or in Bangladesh or somewhere else 10,000, 15,000 miles away from the U.S., or building a win-win relationship with our friends in the Western Hemisphere? We have to start with the idea that that T-shirt is not going to stay here. People have said, one of the major mills, Brunk, is now in bankruptcy; 60,000 jobs were lost. This legislation is not in effect, so it must have been for some other reason. Time marches on.

What we are trying to do is to create a relationship that will produce a lasting, beneficial, harmonious balance in which our friends in our own hemisphere, which also provides us with shortened logistics for our own products to assist, and a little bit of help and recognition, that they have made significant advances on the supply side of the drug problem. We obviously need to work on the demand side, but they are working on the supply side.

So when we listen to the arguments, including the gentleman from American Samoa, about the potential displacement of jobs, that is a real concern for American Samoa because they have a significant number of people who are employed in this industry. What has not been presented yet is clear evidence of the facts that a direct result of what we do will diminish jobs. Will there be readjustment? Will companies go into business and go out of business? Will other companies expand to absorb the loss of the jobs from that other business? That is what we have to analyze; not say, change will take place and, therefore, do not move forward. What is the impact of the change? What is the dynamic of the change, and how can we make sure that any downside is diminished?

My friend came to the floor and mentioned my name a number of times and said that certain bills have not passed and that this should not be in front of trade promotion authority. I will tell my colleagues, I did everything in my

power to make sure that trade promotion authority came first.

I had a letter from the Speaker saying that it was going to be voted on prior to today. I do not control scheduling on the floor. We do know that this particular provision will expire December 4. The Andean bill has been where the Andean bill has been; the trade promotion authority has been changed. This bill has not been changed. Trade promotion authority has been changed. I do not have control over that.

So what we have in front of us today is the possibility to build a stronger lasting relationship with every commitment on the part of the sponsors of this bill; and by the way, there has been a lot of comment about the fact that we have not been bipartisan. I support the bill, the ranking member supports the bill, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), the ranking member on the Subcommittee on Trade supports the bill, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CRANE), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Trade supports the bill. The bill came out of committee on a voice vote.

Mr. Speaker, we can just go so far. It is not perfect. Trade involves relocation. I will commit to anyone, lay the facts in front of me, clear evidence of the downside, and we will work on making that adjustment. But to say that we have to stop now and not move forward in this process because frankly the Senate has to take the bill up, I am quite sure that the Members over there will effect change in the bill. We will have a conference and we will move forward. Our job today is to not send a signal to our friends around the world that the answer is no and nothing.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL).

(Mr. RANGEL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule, and against the cockamamie idea that only people that are against trade or are against the bill can come to the floor to have something to say about it. I just do not believe that when we support a bill or we support a rule, that automatically means that it is bipartisan. Bipartisan means that Republicans and Democrats set aside their labels and try to find out what is best for the country, what is best for international trade, what is best for Members of Congress. Just because everything is not violently opposed does not mean that people support the concept of bringing bills to the floor based on the thoughts of the distinguished chairman from California.

There is the old fashioned way to do it, and they call it hearings. We do not have to do it that way, but just because there is not a name-throwing episode with everything that comes out of the committee, I do not think it raises this type of procedure to the level of being called bipartisan. And supporting

trade, international trade, does not mean that one can be insensitive to the impact that it has on hard-working Americans.

Of course, economic growth is going to be dependent on expansion of trade. Of course, expansion of trade means that there is going to be dislocation and pain. That comes from progress. But it does not mean that we should not be sensitive to the negative impact that it has on hard-working Americans and that we should not do all that we can to ease that pain. And we should discuss it; we should have hearings. Americans, whether in Puerto Rico or whether they are in American Samoa, should have an opportunity to share with us what will be the negative economic impact on our citizens in that part of the world.

□ 0945

The fact that I support the rule and support the legislation does not mean that I am not going to do all I can to make certain that equity is displayed not only for our textile workers and manufacturers, but for our people in American Samoa and people in Puerto Rico.

It seems like if anyone has a complaint about anything, that they are depicted as being whining and screaming and un-American. Even when it gets to the trade promotion authority, one can be even unpatriotic because one disagrees with some unilateral proposal that came out of my committee. We have to get back to the idea that just because we all do not read from the same page does not mean that one is less patriotic than the next person.

I want to say that we have a lot of things to work out here. We have assurances from the chairman that he has to see some negative evidence of what is happening in Samoa and Puerto Rico, and we have to do that. We have to work with our friends, Republicans and Democrats in the Senate. We have to try to perfect this. We have to try to do in conference what we did not do at hearings.

So let us try to be a little more gentle with each other. The country is at war. We have a job to do. We have to have mutual respect for the intent of the Members that are trying to perfect our legislation, and not just be opposed to it.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE).

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, this issue or these represented issues seem to have a way of polarizing Republicans, Democrats, liberals, conservatives, all over the field.

My good friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS), the very able chairman of the powerful Committee on Ways and Means, he and I are at odds on this.

The gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), I am not sure where he is on this; but he is nonetheless my friend, whether he is for me or against me.

Nevertheless, this has a way of separating people. The United States textile industry has already suffered its worst crisis since the Great Depression. We have lost nearly 60,000 jobs, nearly 10 percent of the entire workforce, in just the last 12 months.

Our suppliers in the cotton, wool, man-made fiber, textile, machinery, and chemical industries have also been damaged by this crisis.

H.R. 3009, Mr. Speaker, will be extremely damaging to the United States textile industry. It will cause even more U.S. job losses, and make our current crisis even worse. The bill would harm American textile manufacturers, including producers of fabric, yarn, and thread.

Mr. Speaker, this week, two giants in my district came forward with distressing news. One announced that it is filing chapter 11. A second one announced it is laying off 13,000 workers.

Mr. Speaker, my mom was a machine operator in a hosiery mill. I knew as a youngster in the rural south the significance of a textile check coming in every week as a result of a woman laboring arduously over that machine, before the days of air conditioning, I might add, Mr. Speaker. Now those textile checks are less frequent. They are being seen less and less frequently.

The bill allows, Mr. Speaker, a huge amount of regional fabric made in the Andean countries, increasing to nearly 1 billion square meter equivalent annually by 2006, to be assembled as garments and enter the United States duty free, quota free.

That is a slap in the face to our textile community, which is synonymously known as success in this country. When we mention success, we immediately think of the textile industry, the way it started, the jobs that were created. The bill also allows apparel assembled in the Andean countries of U.S. or Andean regional fabric to use yarn from anywhere in the world.

Finally, unrelated to the basic Andean bill, this legislation would grant duty-free treatment to vast quantities of apparel imports assembled in sub-Saharan Africa from African or Third World countries, usually Asian fabric.

Mr. Speaker, I am unwilling and/or incapable of turning a blind eye and a deaf ear to the textile community which has been so obviously significant in the success of this country. I urge a "no" vote.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DELAHUNT).

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is important to note that this bill is not just about drugs, and it is certainly not just about Colombia. It is about stability in the Andean region.

As someone who serves on the Subcommittee on the Western Hemisphere and who has traveled extensively in the

region, I can tell my colleagues that this region, this region presently is on the verge of profound instability. Things are getting worse. Things are getting substantially worse.

All of these countries are experiencing a level of civil unrest. I think that it is critical to understand. Colombia's economy is still stuck in the worst recession in 70 years. Ecuador's economy is a basket case. Peru and Bolivia remain desperately poor. The conditions in those nations continue to deteriorate.

Now, this decline is partly a result of the extension of trade benefits to the Caribbean Basin, which I opposed. I opposed it because they lack the necessary safeguard in terms of workers, workers' rights, and environmental standards. I opposed it in part because I feared exactly what is happening: workers in the Andean countries are not competing with American workers. They are now competing with workers in the Caribbean because of CBI, and they are losing that competition. The economic impact of September 11 has not even been felt yet, but we know it will.

So it should not come as any surprise that the peasants in those four countries are back growing coca and opium again. The successes that have been achieved in Ecuador, Peru, and Bolivia are eroding rapidly. They are at risk. The unemployment rates in these nations are escalating dramatically.

That is why the economic opportunities provided in this bill are so critical, not just for ending drug cultivation and promoting stability, but they are essential for peace and harmony in the region.

By the way, it is for the same reason that I have been urging the administration to accelerate the dollars that have been appropriated under Plan Colombia for alternative crop substitution and economic development.

Now, I share the concern of my colleagues about labor rights in the region. I am not happy with the labor provisions in the bill. But if the state has failed, there is nobody to guarantee these labor rights, and state collapse may come sooner than we think in the Andean region. The region, believe me, has serious problems.

We have seen what happens when states fail. We have the example currently of Afghanistan. We do not want to allow that to happen in the Andean region. I urge support for the bill.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER).

(Mr. SOUDER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, this is probably the most important antinarcotics vote that will be cast in Congress this year. There is just no way to avoid it.

I do not support TPA. I am not exactly known as Mr. Free Trader. This is something where we have to look at

the facts. As my friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts, just pointed out, whether we like NAFTA or not, we have that; whether we like the Caribbean Basin Initiative or not, whether we like the Andean trade preference, that is what is there now.

This vote is whether to repeal the trade advantage in the most critical cocaine and heroin region in the world at a time that the surrounding nations have these advantages because of the legislation in this United States Congress.

Let us look at the facts of this situation: in Colombia, we once had a narcostate that has now elected a free government, that is helping us eliminate the cocaine and heroin. As they elect a government that now responds to our concerns, we are going to tell them they do not have anywhere to sell their products if the farmers stop growing poppy and coca?

In Bolivia, which used to supply 30 percent of our cocaine and heroin, they now are down to less than 5 percent and going towards complete eradication. We have a president who succeeded President Banzer, President Quiroga, who is committed to providing trade opportunities so the campesinos have some way to feed their families other than feeding our children cocaine and heroin. And we are going to say, no, we are going to stop that trade?

In Peru, we have a newly elected government, a country riven by tremendous crisis because of past illegal activities in security issues with President Fujimori. That president is trying to build and rebuild a coalition, and we want to yank his opportunity out from underneath him? Mind you, we already have an Andean trade preference. This is whether to repeal it. We are going to yank it out at a critical time in Peruvian history?

In Ecuador, which has had five different governments in 5 years, that is teetering on instability. As we see the coca and heroin producers look at their region as a possible place to go in, we want to tell their government that is saying, we need to trade, we need to build our relations with the United States, we want to stiff-arm them and repeal their opportunities?

For those who come here and say, we do not want to do eradication, we do not want to do fumigation, we do not want to shoot down airplanes, to do all the interdiction, we do not want to throw people in prisons, what do they propose to do to help these people?

My friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts, has said it well: in the Andean initiative, we are trying to do alternative development. We are trying to rebuild their legal systems. But we are going to stop and repeal the trade initiatives at the very time this Congress has put \$1 billion into Plan Colombia, we are putting another half a billion into the Andean initiative, and now we want to yank out the essential follow-through that gives something

for these people to do to make a living to feed their families at a time when they most need it?

I just do not understand it. My friends who supported the interdiction efforts, as we eradicate their crops, as we intercept their ships, as we shoot down their planes, what do we propose they do? That is a fundamental question Members are dealing with today.

We cannot on the one hand, and look, this is a tough decision. I understand that this is not likely to help my district in the trade question, but it is certainly going to help the kids and families on the streets of Indiana if we can lower the amount of heroin and cocaine coming in and protect them.

We have to make some tough decisions. I strongly support this act. It is essential. It is the centerpiece of the antidrug efforts. We cannot just tell these people: eat coke. We have to have an alternative.

This is not an easy vote, but it is one of the most essential votes in this hemisphere in the antidrug efforts that Members will cast this year or next year.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER).

(Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I am disappointed that the Committee on Rules refused to allow an amendment that I made a request on which would require the certification by the President that Colombia is actively engaged in the investigation of the murder of labor activists in its country.

The country, Colombia, has exported many products to the United States; but that is not what it will be remembered for. It will be remembered for the killings that are taking place.

During the 1990s, more trade union activists were killed in Colombia than any other country. No other country is even close. The numbers are truly astonishing. Over 1,000 labor activists have been murdered since this trade agreement was enacted.

It is not because of this trade agreement; but the fact is, during this 10-year relationship, that is what has happened. In this year alone, 131 labor activists have been killed. This cannot just be a coincidence of these people being killed in the firefight that is taking place.

I do not diminish the complexity of the problems of violence in Colombia on both the right and the left, but the fact of the matter is that, according to the ILO, these murders have continued. They have not been investigated. People have not been identified. The core ILO agreements have not been dealt with.

In fact, the ILO report of last year says that the cases where the instigators and perpetrators of the murders of

trade union leader are identified are practically nonexistent, as is handing down guilty verdicts.

□ 1000

The point is this, the government is doing little or nothing to try to investigate and identify the people who are killing the labor activists across the country. When labor activists are asking for protection from the government the protection is not forthcoming and the assassinations continue. These people are assassinated at work. They are assassinated in the streets. They are assassinated in their own homes in front of their families. And they are all labor activists. That is what they have in common. The time has come to stop that.

We talk about the benefits of the trade agreements. One of the benefits, theoretically, is the labor will prosper, the people have the ability to organize. They will improve their working conditions. They will improve their pay, and they will be able to provide for their families. But that does not happen in and of itself. It happens because labor organizers talk to the workers. They talk to them about the benefits of joining a union.

Colombia has a history of union involvement but it is now being eradicated. According to the ILO, it is being eradicated by the para-military organizations on the right for the most part. And I think it is time to come where not only we will be investing in Plan Colombia, but we are extending trade agreements to Colombia that we understand the need to stop the assassination in this country of these labor activists, because it just takes away any ability to try and organize the working place so, in fact, people can have the benefits that supposedly free trade is supposed to bring to those countries in terms of the economic opportunity.

Thirty members of the Congress joined me in sending a letter to the president of Colombia asking for these investigations, asking for an effort to bring these people to justice. And we have received no response from the president. And I was hoping that this amendment would have been accepted and we could have sent that message to the president requiring those actions to take place in the certification by the President of United States that those investigations were ongoing. Unfortunately, this trade agreement will probably pass. Those investigations will not take place. We are talking about a reign of terrorism in Colombia right under our noses in a country where we are financing a war supposedly to end that; and yet we cannot get the government to participate in the effort to investigate these assassinations and these crimes against labor activists. I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODE).

Mr. GOODE. Mr. Speaker, I must rise in opposition to H.R. 3009. I have had

hundreds of letters from textile employees and the plant managers from my part of Virginia. They are very concerned that this legislation, if passed and signed into law, will cost more jobs in southside Virginia. This week VF. Knitwear announced the termination of 2,300 persons in Martinsville and Henry County. This brings to a total of over 10,000 jobs lost in the past year and a half under the so-called free-trade benefits.

This bill is a turkey. It would be an awful Thanksgiving present for the persons in my district if this bill were to pass. We need to kill this turkey, and we need to relegate it to a place where hope is a stranger and where mercy will never reach.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT).

(Mr. SPRATT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, the Andean Free Trade Preference Act expires in December; and if all we were talking about was the extension of the bill, it would be a simple matter. Most of us would vote for it. But this Andean Free Trade Pact extension is also an expansion. It goes far beyond simply expanding the free trade pact that has been in existence for the last 10 years.

First of all, for the first time it extends duty-free, quota-free access to textile and apparel imports from four countries, the Andean countries. Secondly, it takes this bill which needs to pass in December and piggybacks on to it wholly gratuitous concessions to sub-Saharan African countries, 22 of them, who last year got substantial concessions in the African Growth and Opportunity Act. And then it extends a third time substantial concessions to the Caribbean countries, 24 of them.

So we have really got three trade-expansion bills wrapped up in one. If it were just the Andean Pact we were talking about, it would be simple; but the problem is it goes much further.

Mr. Speaker, over the last 15 years, we have liberalized trade and textiles and apparel again and again and again. First there was free trade for Israel. Then there was free trade or substantial concessions for the Caribbean countries. Then there was NAFTA. Then there were more concessions for the Caribbean countries so they would be treated like Mexico. Then there was the phase-out and elimination of quotas as a result of agreement on textile and clothing which was part of the WTO agreement in 1994.

What is the result? What is the result of all of these free-trade concessions? Today, last year, textile and apparel imports into this country were \$77.5 billion, \$77.5 billion, up by 90 percent since 1994. Up by \$35 billion since 1994.

What is the result for the American textile worker? When I came here in 1983, there were 2.1, 2.2 million Americans engaged in textiles and apparel. Today there is barely over a million.

And in the last 9 months, 118,000 textile and apparel workers have lost their jobs in this country. In the last 3 months, 46,000 textile and apparel workers have lost their jobs. This bill, this triple package with the Andean countries and the Caribbean countries and the sub-Saharan African countries all benefiting, substantially gaining greater rights to duty-free, quota-free access to our markets, this bill cannot help but continue the hemorrhage in job losses that we have experienced for the last 10 years.

This struggling industry will be dealt a death blow by this particular bill. I am not exaggerating.

There is a simpler, easier conclusion. We can have a clean bill, a mere expansion of the Andean Trade Preference Act, extend it for 5 years, extend it for 10 years. It does not matter to me what you extend it for, but keep it clean. Keep it related to the purpose at hand. Simply extend the pact that we have got. I will give the House that opportunity when the time comes for a motion to recommit, if of course this motion is not defeated; and that is the most efficient solution, defeat the motion and send the bill back so that it conforms to simply the Andean Free Trade Pact.

But if the rule passes, I will offer a motion to recommit which will give everybody in the House that option, the option simply of extending the Andean Trade Pact so it helps those countries that we purport to help; but it does not help them at the expense of the million textile workers who are still left.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my good friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM), for a colloquy with the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS).

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I would like to enter into a colloquy with my friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS).

The reason is the U.S. must continue to exempt canned tuna or they will destroy domestic processing and the entire fishing industry not only in California but Samoa, Puerto Rico, and other places. I have been working with my good friend, the gentleman from American Samoa (Mr. FALBOMAVEGA), and others on this position.

Mr. Speaker, I understand that the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) has committed if we can bring him the facts that in the conference report he will take into consideration and allow our amendment that will at least stop the loss of jobs. And we estimate right now just in San Diego over 10,000 jobs will be lost if they are able to dump this tuna. Do we have the gentleman's commitment to take a look at the facts and work this in conference, because the Senate supports our position?

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I will tell the gentleman, as I said both privately and publicly, we are currently analyzing the situation. We have been provided by our friend from American

Samoa an amendment something other than simply banning. That is a significant step in the right direction.

We are willing to look at limitations on volume, quota or consumption, whichever is the most appropriate structure. I understand and appreciate the gentleman's concern because he is dealing with only a canning operation in which the processing comes from the very country that is the subject of the tuna expansion in Andean and Ecuador. And the pressures are significant. The facts are there. We will make adjustments so that the gentleman will have at least a minimal comfort level.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I thank and I take the gentleman's words from California (Mr. THOMAS) as a friend and I take his word as gospel. But I will say if the problem cannot be worked out, my friends from American Samoa, from Puerto Rico and from California, we will be forced in the conference report to vote against the rule, to vote against the conference report; and then I will support the motion to recommit in the conference report.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I will tell my friend who said that the solution is to simply extend the Andean Pact, it means the African provisions are out, the Caribbean provisions are out and all of the help, as the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) said, in replacing the drug costs will be out as well. That does not sound exactly like a good deal.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time is remaining on either side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) has 6½ minutes. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART) has 4½ minutes.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR).

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise on the debate on the rule to urge defeat of this rule. I ask defeat of this rule because of the situation at hand. The United States Congress has been asked to adopt, reapprove the Andean Trade Act, which was adopted over 10 years ago. It had a sunset in it so that there would be debate to be able to revise it and look at it and debate it.

This bill comes to the floor without any public hearings, without any debate. In fact, it was rushed through the Committee on Rules just a few hours ago. And now we are asked to adopt one of the most important trade policies to affect the southern hemisphere. It affects all of Central America, the Caribbean, and the Andean region of Latin America.

There are a lot of concerns that you hear from Members here, concerns that ought to be addressed and these trade agreements ought to be modernized and updated with the circumstances at

hand. And we need to have a public process and a public hearing to do that. It did not occur here; and, therefore, the rule ought to be defeated and the bill ought to be defeated.

Yes, there is pressure on us because the bill does sunset. But we can do a better job than what we have done with bringing this bill to the floor at this time, at this moment. So I urge a defeat of the rule.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), the distinguished chairman on the Committee on Rules.

(Mr. DREIER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, there is an expression that probably will only be understood by my friend, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART), of those in the Chamber. I do not know how many bilingual people there are here. But I have struggled, as the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART) knows, with my Spanish and this was a term that was taught to me by our distinguished colleague, the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. NAPOLITANO). It is: "Tapar el sol con un dedo."

It basically means you try to block the sun with your thumb, which obviously is not going to happen. We need to realize that there is overwhelming momentum worldwide to break down tariff barriers and to expand trade.

Many people who traditionally have not been supportive of that in the past in Latin America are now strong proponents; and we know that, obviously, improved trade increases the standard of living for people. It allows them to focus on political repression and other challenges.

This bill is designed to deal with a number of factors. Obviously, it is focused on challenges that exist in Africa and the Caribbean basin. One of key issues in focusing on Andean trade is that we have been able to do everything possible to try and wean those countries that have been reliant on the crops that provided drugs to move off of that.

□ 1015

Several weeks ago, I and a number of my colleagues had the opportunity to visit Bolivia, and there is no stronger example of a nation which has stood for that transfer away from coca, the drug crop, to legal, wonderful, productive crops than Bolivia. And there needs to be an even greater incentive as we try to diminish that flow of illicit drugs into the United States and other parts of the world. This measure is designed to do just that.

There are, as has been pointed out in the debate, a wide range of other factors included in here, and there are concerns. But as I said with that expression, to try to block the sun with your thumb is something that we cannot do here. The world is changing, and

I am happy to say that it is moving towards free trade because it does benefit the consumers. I do not want to see the tuna industry impacted negatively, I do not want to see the textile industry impacted negatively. And I know there are very understandable questions that have come forward, and I hope that we will be able to take steps to diminish the deleterious impact that this might have.

I am convinced, I am convinced that as we deal with these shifts that have taken place domestically, as was pointed out earlier in the debate, that are now taking place globally, it is clearly the right thing for us to do to move in this direction. Our next step, then, Mr. Speaker, will be to grant trade promotion authority so that we can expand even further the very, very important message of freedom.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. TAUSCHER).

Mrs. TAUSCHER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time, and I rise in support of the Andean Trade Preference Act.

We are at a critical point in our ongoing relationship with our good friends in Central and South America. The expansion and extension of ATPA is a necessary component of a comprehensive strategy to improve our collective security in the Western Hemisphere.

We have already established free trade agreements with Canada and Mexico, and now we must look to widen our horizon, expand our opportunities and share the good fortunes of trade with our Andean neighbors and then the rest of the democratic countries of South America.

The ATPA has helped foster trade between the United States and the Andean region that has nearly doubled over the last decade to \$18 billion to the mutual benefit of the United States and Andean businesses. To date, we have made a bet that a \$1.3 billion American assistance program can help solve this problem. If we truly want to shape the environment to ensure our success, we must protect our bet with a trade package that sets the conditions for economies that need to change their earnings from drug money to industries that are part of the 21st century economy.

I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on H.R. 3009, the Andean Trade Promotion and Drug Eradication Act.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire again how much time there is?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). The gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) has 3½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART) has 1½ minutes remaining.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EVANS).

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, this rule prevents consideration of an amendment the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) and I would have introduced to strike Colombia from this trade preference due to their horrendous record on labor rights.

This bill allows Colombia to import numerous goods across our borders duty free. This preference costs us \$262 million. This is a lot of lost revenue at the expense of a country that does nothing to ensure the basic security of trade unionists. Four thousand trade unionists have been gunned down in the last few years, and 133 trade unionists have been murdered this year alone. In Colombia, virtual immunity exists for the murderers of these trade unionists.

The Miller-Evans amendment suspends Colombia from this trade preference until it begins to investigate the murders of these labor leaders. We are really not asking too much for several million dollars of duty free treatment.

I think we should stand in solidarity with the families of the 4,000-plus slain union leaders in Colombia that died for peace and human rights while their pleas for protection have been ignored by their own government. Their families have no consolation as the killers or these trade unionists remain free from prosecution.

I urge my colleagues to remember that labor rights are human rights. Trade unionists risk their lives every day to ensure no person is subject to a wage that does not allow them to feed their family or works in a hazardous and dangerous workplace around the world. These are basic principles we must insist on if Colombia is ever to receive the benefits of trade with our Nation.

I urge my colleagues to stand up and fight for labor rights and human rights.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Washington State (Mr. BAIRD).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Washington is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Speaker, last weekend, I had the great privilege of visiting the Pendleton Woolen Mills in Washougal, Washington. I met with many of the hundreds of employees who work there, many of whom have been there for 20 or 30 years. Their whole life has been spent working in one of America's finest textile industries.

The challenge we face today is that we are presented with legislation that possibly will cost these people their jobs, with very, very little time to discuss this, with little time to debate it, and with little time to explore the ways we can improve it and minimize the impact on the people who might be displaced.

I have supported trade, proudly supported trade in this body: trade in the Caribbean, trade with Africa, and trade with China, and elsewhere in the world. But to bring a piece of legislation to this body with so little time, when it could affect so many of our American workers, is not the kind of procedure we should follow. It does a disservice to those workers, and frankly, it does a disservice to the principles of trade itself.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this piece of legislation and "no" on the rule until we get this right. We need time, we owe the time to the people whose jobs could be lost, to do this right.

I am a supporter of trade, but we need to return to a more deliberative, conceptual, thoughtful process here in this body; we are not doing it, and it is a darn shame. I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this rule.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, has the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) yielded back her time?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from New York has 1½ minutes remaining.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I wish to thank all my colleagues who have spoken today and in the Committee on Rules, where we met at 7:00 this morning and had a hearing and a vote on this very important legislation before bringing it to the floor.

We are dealing, with regard to the Andean region, with four democracies. I am a strong believer and always have been in free trade among free peoples. There are four democracies in this hemisphere, allies of the United States, facing tremendous challenges, not the least of which is narcotrafficking. The strongest signal we could send to them, that we appreciate their friendship, and that we look forward to working with them to mutually seek progress and prosperity in the United States and in our neighborhood in this hemisphere, is by passing this legislation today.

With regard to the argument that there have been problems with labor leaders in Colombia, the same person that came to advocate for that today before the Committee on Rules to prevent free trade with Colombia, advocates for free trade, for example, with the only dictatorship in this hemisphere today where there are no labor rights. How can you be for free trade with the Cuban dictatorship, where there are absolutely no labor rights, and then come and advocate for the denial of free trade or a trade relationship with a democracy because there are some problems?

So, anyway, this is important legislation, and I want to thank those who have worked so hard on it. It expires, the agreement with the Andean countries, December 4, so in talking about

timeliness, it is so important, Mr. Speaker, that we pass this before we leave today or tomorrow for a few days, before we come back. And so I would urge my colleagues to support the underlying legislation and to support this rule.

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this rule and to applaud the conferees for their work on the Aviation Security conference report.

This conference report will provide the government with the ability to fully protect our citizens from another horrible attack such as the ones that occurred on September 11.

I especially want to applaud the successful efforts of the conferees in both Houses to remove the "Super-citizenship" clause that was present in the Senate bill.

Many of us in Congress and in minority communities throughout the country were very concerned about that provision because it allowed naturalized citizens to be treated differently than natural-born citizens.

Had the "Super-citizenship" provision been enacted, it would have set the first precedent for further restrictions on a portion of our U.S. citizenry.

I and many others are comforted by the fact that the conference took a fair and just stance on this issue.

I do have to acknowledge, though, that thousands of Legal Permanent Residents will lose their jobs as a result of this legislation.

This is yet another strong argument for worker relief.

We cannot purposely take jobs away from hard-working, tax-paying individuals without offering them assistance.

I hope my colleagues will join me in efforts to address the needs of screeners who, through no fault of their own, will soon be standing in the unemployment line.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule because it did not allow an amendment submitted by Representative GEORGE MILLER on violence against Colombian labor leaders.

I strongly believe that Colombia should benefit from the Andean Trade Preferences Act.

If we want Colombia to abandon illegal commerce, then we must provide Colombia with benefits and incentives to support of legal enterprises. This trade amendment is one such effort to do that.

This bill might have a negative impact on some textile companies in my own congressional district, although that is not assured. It would be a lot easier for those business owners and the workers to accept this trade agreement if they knew that Colombia's workers were protected from human rights violence. At a minimum, the companies and workers in my district need to know that if the worst happens, and Colombian union leaders and workers are murdered, then Colombian justice will actively investigate, hunt down, prosecute, and imprison the murderers.

Unfortunately, that is not the case. Earlier this year, I met with a very impressive delegation of Colombian business leaders, members of the Colombian Chamber of Commerce. They also believe that the Colombian government needs to do a great deal more to protect both business owners and union leaders from kidnapping and murder. More trade unionists are killed in Colombia than all other countries combined.

Mr. Speaker, that is a horrible reality. I have been to Colombia. I know that everyone in every part of the country is threatened by violence. The sources of violence include the paramilitary groups, the guerrilla forces and official armed forces. I know that stopping the violence will take a long time.

Congressman Mr. MILLER was not asking for anything so grand in his amendment.

We are only asking that the Colombian Government apprehend and try the parties responsible for the killings of trade union members. Not because they are more important than any other sector of Colombian society, but because such action will send a clear message that impunity is ended for those who target labor leaders for murder.

I want to promote and expand legal commerce and markets for Colombia.

All I ask for is that Colombia demonstrate the political will to demand justice for murdered labor leaders.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 225, nays 191, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 446]

YEAS—225

Aderholt	Crenshaw	Greenwood
Akin	Crowley	Grucci
Armey	Culberson	Gutknecht
Bachus	Cunningham	Hansen
Baker	Davis (FL)	Hart
Ballenger	Davis, Jo Ann	Hastings (WA)
Barr	Davis, Tom	Hayworth
Bartlett	Deal	Hefley
Barton	DeLay	Herger
Bass	Diaz-Balart	Hill
Bereuter	Dooley	Hilleary
Berman	Doolittle	Hinojosa
Biggert	Dreier	Hobson
Bilirakis	Duncan	Hooley
Blumenauer	Dunn	Horn
Blunt	Edwards	Hostettler
Boehlert	Ehlers	Houghton
Boehner	Ehrlich	Hoyer
Bonilla	Emerson	Hulshof
Boswell	English	Hunter
Brady (TX)	Eshoo	Hyde
Brown (SC)	Ferguson	Inslee
Bryant	Fletcher	Isakson
Burton	Foley	Issa
Buyer	Forbes	Istook
Callahan	Fossella	Jenkins
Calvert	Frelinghuysen	Johnson (CT)
Camp	Gallegly	Johnson (IL)
Cannon	Ganske	Johnson, Sam
Cantor	Gekas	Keller
Capito	Gibbons	Kelly
Carson (OK)	Gilchrest	Kennedy (MN)
Chabot	Gillmor	Kennedy (RI)
Chambliss	Gilman	Kerns
Collins	Goodlatte	Kind (WI)
Combest	Goss	King (NY)
Cooksey	Granger	Kingston
Cox	Graves	Kirk
Crane	Green (WI)	Knollenberg

Kolbe	Pence	Simpson
LaHood	Peterson (PA)	Skeen
Larsen (WA)	Petri	Smith (MI)
Larson (CT)	Pitts	Smith (NJ)
Latham	Platts	Smith (TX)
LaTourette	Pombo	Smith (WA)
Leach	Portman	Souder
Lewis (CA)	Pryce (OH)	Stearns
Lewis (KY)	Putnam	Stump
Linder	Quinn	Sununu
LoBiondo	Radanovich	Sweeney
Lofgren	Ramstad	Tancredo
Lucas (OK)	Rangel	Tauscher
Manzullo	Regula	Tauzin
Matheson	Rehberg	Terry
McCrery	Reynolds	Thomas
McHugh	Riley	Thornberry
McInnis	Rogers (MI)	Thune
McKeon	Rohrabacher	Tiahrt
Mica	Roukema	Tiberi
Miller, Dan	Royce	Toomey
Miller, Gary	Ryan (WI)	Trafigant
Miller, Jeff	Ryun (KS)	Vitter
Moran (KS)	Sandlin	Walden
Moran (VA)	Saxton	Walsh
Morella	Schaffer	Wamp
Neal	Schrock	Watkins (OK)
Nethercutt	Sensenbrenner	Watts (OK)
Ney	Sessions	Weldon (FL)
Northup	Shadegg	Weldon (PA)
Nussle	Shaw	Weller
Osborne	Shays	Whitfield
Ose	Sherwood	Wicker
Otter	Shimkus	Wilson
Oxley	Shuster	Wolf
Paul	Simmons	Young (FL)

NAYS—191

Abercrombie	Gephardt	Myrick
Ackerman	Gonzalez	Nadler
Allen	Goode	Napolitano
Andrews	Gordon	Norwood
Baca	Graham	Oberstar
Baird	Green (TX)	Obey
Baldacci	Gutierrez	Olver
Baldwin	Hall (TX)	Ortiz
Barcia	Harman	Owens
Barrett	Hayes	Pallone
Becerra	Hilliard	Pascarell
Bentsen	Hinchee	Pastor
Berkley	Hoeffel	Payne
Berry	Hoekstra	Pelosi
Bishop	Holden	Peterson (MN)
Blagojevich	Holt	Phelps
Boniior	Honda	Pickering
Borski	Israel	Pomeroy
Boucher	Jackson (IL)	Price (NC)
Boyd	Jackson-Lee	Rahall
Brady (PA)	(TX)	Reyes
Brown (FL)	Jefferson	Rivers
Brown (OH)	John	Rodriguez
Burr	Jones (NC)	Roemer
Capps	Jones (OH)	Rogers (KY)
Capuano	Kanjorski	Ross
Cardin	Kaptur	Rothman
Carson (IN)	Kildee	Roybal-Allard
Castle	Kilpatrick	Rush
Clayton	Kleczka	Sabo
Clement	Kucinich	Sanchez
Clyburn	LaFalce	Sanders
Coble	Lampson	Sawyer
Condit	Langevin	Schakowsky
Conyers	Lee	Schiff
Costello	Levin	Scott
Coyne	Lewis (GA)	Serrano
Cramer	Lipinski	Sherman
Cummings	Lowe	Shows
Davis (CA)	Lucas (KY)	Skelton
Davis (IL)	Luther	Slaughter
DeFazio	Lynch	Snyder
DeGette	Maloney (CT)	Solis
Delahunt	Maloney (NY)	Spratt
DeLauro	Markey	Stark
DeMint	Mascara	Stenholm
Deutsch	Matsui	Strickland
Dicks	McCarthy (MO)	Stupak
Dingell	McCarthy (NY)	Tanner
Doggett	McCollum	Taylor (MS)
Doyle	McDermott	Taylor (NC)
Engel	McGovern	Thompson (CA)
Etheridge	McIntyre	Thompson (MS)
Evans	McKinney	Thurman
Everett	McNulty	Tierney
Farr	Menendez	Towns
Fattah	Miller, George	Turner
Filner	Mink	Udall (CO)
Ford	Mollohan	Udall (NM)
Frank	Moore	Upton
Frost	Murtha	Velazquez

Visclosky	Watt (NC)	Woolsey
Waters	Weiner	Wu
Watson (CA)	Wexler	Wynn

NOT VOTING—16

Bono	Johnson, E. B.	Millender-
Clay	Lantos	McDonald
Cubin	Largent	Ros-Lehtinen
Flake	Meehan	Waxman
Hall (OH)	Meek (FL)	Young (AK)
Hastings (FL)	Meeks (NY)	

□ 1045

Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, Mrs. MALONEY of New York and Messrs. FORD, SKELTON, SNYDER, McDERMOTT, TOWNS and PAYNE changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. ROHRABACHER and Mr. TANCREDO changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 446, had I been here I would have voted “no” on this bill; however, I was detained by a conference meeting with the White House and was unable to vote at the appropriate time.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Monahan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 1042. An act to prevent the elimination of certain reports.

H.R. 1552. An act to extend the moratorium enacted by the Internet Tax Freedom Act through November 1, 2003, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2924. An act to provide authority to the Federal Power Marketing Administrations to reduce vandalism and destruction of property, and for other purposes.

H.J. Res. 74. Joint resolution making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2002, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed with amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 717. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for research with respect to various forms of muscular dystrophy, including Duchenne, Becker, limb girdle, congenital, facioscapulohumeral, myotonic, oculopharyngeal, distal, and Emery-Dreifuss muscular dystrophies.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed bills and a concurrent resolution of the following titles in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 739. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve programs for homeless veterans, and for other purposes.

S. 1196. An act to amend the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, and for other purposes.

S. 1202. An act to amend the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) to extend the authorization of appropriations for the Office of Government Ethics through fiscal year 2006.